REMARKS

Claims 38-52, 118-125 and 128-131 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-37, 53-117, 126 and 127 are currently pending, with claims 1 and 27 being in independent form. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 13-15, 21-37, 56-65, 82-94 , 112-117, 126 and 127 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has indicated that the information disclosure (IDS) filed on April 4, 2002 has not been considered because a copy of Form PTO-1449 is missing. Applicants have re-submitted a copy of the IDS to have the reference cited therein entered and considered. Entry and consideration of the IDS is requested, and notice to that effect is solicited.

The Examiner has indicated that the specification should be amended to indicate that the Application is a 371 of PCT/EP00/06119 filed on 6/30/2000 in the first sentence(s) of the specification following the title. A Preliminary Amendment was filed on August 6, 2002 to amend the specification in the required manner. Withdrawal of this objection is therefore in order.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that the priority document has not been received by the Patent Office. Applicant will file the priority document at a subsequent point in time, upon which a notice that the priority document has been received and entered into the record is requested.

In the December 18, 2006 Office Action, independent claims 1 and 27 and dependent claims 2-26, 28-38, 113-117, 126 and 127 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because, with respect to independent claim 1, the claimed requirement of "'to enable automatic location of a site...' [allegedly] does not mean a result is actually performed, and hence the claim does not produce a useful, concrete, or tangible result", and with respect to independent claim 27, "a register comprising: content information, associated address information, and location information does not provide functional [descriptive] language, it is considered Non-Functional Descriptive Material".

In response to the foregoing, applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite the limitation "wherein said content information for a site comprises an attribute associated therewith, and wherein said content defining information is used for automatically locating sites having content corresponding to the content defining information". Independent claim 27

19

has been correspondingly amended to recite the limitation "wherein said content information for a site comprises an attribute associated therewith, and address information associated with the content defining information to identify sites which contain the content defined by the content defining information, and location information identifying a geographic location with which a site defined by said address information is associated". No new matter has been added. Independent claim 1 has thus been amended to limit each to a practical application that produces a useful, tangible and concrete result, and independent claim 27 has been amended to recite functional, descriptive language. In view of the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 27 as now amended are directed to statutory subject matter and, accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 are deemed to be in order, and notice to that effect is requested.

Claims 1-37, 53-117, 126 and 127 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In response to these rejections, Applicant has amended the claims to address this rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

In the December 13, 2006, Office Action, independent claims 1 and 27, and dependent claims 2, 14-15, 19, 25, 26, 28-30, 83, 110, 113-115, 126 and 127 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,032,162 ("*Burke*"), while dependent claims 3-12, 20-23, 31-35, 53-81, 84-93, 95-109, 111, 116 and 117 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Burke* in view of U.S. Patent No. U.S. 6,314,423 ("*Himmel*"). Lastly, dependent claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Burke* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,560,640 ("*Smethers*"). For the following reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims of the present application are patentable over the combination of the cited references.

The claimed invention is directed to the use of a set of attributes that describe the information content of a given website and that is stored on a terminal device. The required location information is accessed by requesting a page in terms of an attribute which characterized the information content of a website. In accordance with the claimed invention, a request for local information is permitted to be made in terms of the required information content rather than, as in the prior art, by requesting a specific URL. As a result, the ability to identify multiple

sites containing the required information is achieved, as opposed to simply a specific site associated with a bookmark. The claimed invention provides a flexible service, because the limit of information available is the range of attributes understood by the bookmark.

In accordance with the claimed invention, as opposed to storing specific addresses for a site (that is a website), information defining the content of the site is stored. For example, the content information could be travel information. By defining the content information rather than an address information, a user can, for example, move from one location to another and still find relevant information. For example, if the content information consituted local train times, a user would be able to obtain London local train times when in London and New York local train times when in New York.

Burke relates to the processing, storage and activation of Internet address links (see col. 1, lines 5-7). *Burke* (col. 2, lines 23-26; Fig. 1) teaches a system that supports the upload, download and storage of bookmarks addresses, i.e., URLs, using a remote Internet site. *Burke* (col. 2, lines 26-35) describes that "[a] user sends an individual bookmark or a file of bookmarks from the User's Internet terminal 10 to a remote Internet system 15 for storage. Bookmarks stored by the remote Internet system are downloaded to the User's terminal upon User access request. Further, upon user command, data is transferred from a source at a selected downloaded Internet bookmark address to terminal 10 for User viewing or processing. The data transferred from the source at the selected downloaded bookmark address comprises web page information".

Burke thus teaches the following. Bookmark addresses, i.e., URL addresses, are stored in a remote internet site. The remote internet site stores bookmarks. The bookmarks may have a categorization tag associated therewith. These attributes are used in the remote site for collating the bookmarks and controlling the way the bookmarks are displayed. The user is then able to select a bookmark. Finally, a bookmark identifies a particular website.

However, *Burke* fails to teach the claimed invention of amended independent claim 1, which recites "a terminal for use with an information network, said terminal comprising a register for storing content information defining the content of one or more sites in said information network, wherein said content information for a site comprises an attribute associated therewith, and wherein said content defining information is used for automatically locating sites having content corresponding to the content defining information, i.e., a terminal having a register which stores content information. This content information defines the content

21

or nature of a site. Using the content information, the site that also has content corresponding to the content information can be automatically located. Clearly there is a difference between a bookmark that is an actual physical address and content information that defines the nature of the content of the website for example, travel information, weather information or the like.

The bookmark disclosed in *Burke* is, for example, www.londonweather.com. However, by using the content information rather than the bookmark information, appropriate websites can be found regardless of the location of the user. The concept of using content information and using that content information to locate a particular site is not disclosed in *Burke*. *Burke* relies only on the actual address of the site. In view of the foregoing, *Burke* fails to anticipate independent claim 1, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) are, therefore, requested, and a notice to this effect is in order.

Himmel relates to a method for providing a set of bookmarks in a browser for retrieving Web pages in an Internet environment (see col. 1, lines 12-14). However, *Himmel* fails to cure the deficiency of *Burke*. *Himmel* also describes sets of bookmarks, i.e. URL addresses. *Himmel* teaches that the user needs to select from this list of bookmarks. The bookmarks are categorized but the user is still required to select from the list of bookmarks. Accordingly, it is not possible to automatically locate sites with content corresponding to the content information, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Himmel (col. 11, lines 3-17) describes that the bookmarks which are included in a displayed list may depend on the geographic region. However, this is only described in the context of advertising bookmarks. There is no disclosure of using content information in order to automatically locate sites having content corresponding to the content information, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Therefore, the combination of *Burke* and *Himmel* fails to achieve the claimed terminal for use with an information network.

Smethers relates to a method for enabling wireless devices to implement bookmarks with improved transmission efficiency, reduced user navigation and/or reduced amounts of memory resources (see col. 2, lines 37-40). However, *Smethers* also fails to teach or suggest the use of content information in order to automatically locate sites having content corresponding to the content information, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Therefore, individually or in combination, *Burke* and *Smethers* or even *Himmel* fail to achieve the terminal recited in amended

independent claim 1. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 are in order, and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Amended independent claim 27 is a register associated with the terminal of independent method claim 1. Accordingly, amended independent claim 27 is patentable over the cited references for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

In view of the patentability of independent claims 1 and 27 for the reasons set forth above, dependent claims 2-6, 28-37, 53-117, 126 and 127 are all patentable over the prior art.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should be in condition for allowance. Early passage of this case to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By _____
Alphonso A. Collins
Reg. No. 43,559
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: April 13, 2007